

IN THE DRAWINGS

A new page 1 with figures 1-4 identified as Prior Art is attached. This sheet is labeled ``Replacement Sheet'' in the page header. While the examiner requested that figures 5 and 6 be also labeled prior art, only applicant's teaching results in the subject matter of these drawings and accordingly applicant does not think that they should be labeled prior art.

REMARKS

Claims 1,2,5,6,8 and 9 have been rejected as being anticipated by Pedersen U.S. Patent No. 4,017,683. The examiner relies on the use of the word ``struck'' in Pedersen. This word is a typographical error in Pedersen and clearly should read ``stuck'' in Pedersen. Two parallel sentences found in column 18, lines 48-54, of Pedersen demonstrate this error:

1. ``. . . no current continued condition if it gets open due to an open wire, bad power supply (line supply) or sender stuck in the spacing condition.''

2. ``. . . current continuous condition if the line is shorted at the sender end, or if the sender is struck (sic) in the marking condition.''

The correct word in Pedersen is ``stuck'', not struck. From a clear reading of Pedersen, Pedersen is not referring to a mechanical human action but a signal that is ``stuck'' in a particular electrical state (note that the letter ``r'' is next to the letter ``t'' on a standard keyboard. The following points are relevant:

1. The circuitry associated with signal lines 26 discussed above is only an optisolator and protective diode. There is nothing to detect a mechanical action.

2. In all the circuitry, there are no sensors to have the device sensitive to a striking action. The reset circuit (62) is a manual push button.

The Examiner's ongoing discussion presuming the mechanical action of being struck or striking the device as a means for control, is reading into Pedersen technology that is not there.

The Examiner also relies on Pedersen as having a ``receiver'' (col. 5, line 58 to col.6, line 20). This receiver does not receive and process acoustic noise or echo. The referred to circuit deals with internal circuit and data transmission validation.

Yiu merely disclose a communication system with a microphone.

Awada discloses a communication system with a mobile phone.

Claim 1 defines ``means for operating said deactivation means to turn off a ring signal by striking the communication device''. No reference discloses this structure. Independent claim 5 defines ``means for operating said deactivation means to turn off the alert signal by striking the communication device''. No reference discloses this structure.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 2 as anticipated by Pedersen is in error and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Spencer T. Smith
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 25,926

January 5, 2006

53 Silver Brook Lane
North Granby, CT 06060

(860) 814-4052
(860) 814-4173